

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 236

July 24, 1996, 12:02 pm
Page S-8592 Temp. Record

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS/Market Access Program Funding Cut

SUBJECT: Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1997 . . . H.R. 3603. Cochran motion to table the Bryan amendment No. 4972.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 55-42

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 3603, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1997, will appropriate \$54.3 billion in new budget authority, 76 percent of which will be for mandatory spending programs and 76 percent of which will be for food welfare programs (both mandatory and discretionary).

The Bryan amendment would prohibit spending more than \$70 million in funds appropriated by this Act on the Market Access Program (the successor to the Market Promotion Program).

Following debate, Senator Cochran moved to table the Bryan amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The Market Access Program, and its predecessor, the Market Promotion Program, have been exhaustively debated over the years. Senators know that the United States has a net trade surplus in agricultural products of \$20 billion yearly; they know that every billion dollars in exports creates 20,000 jobs; they know that the Department of Agriculture estimates that every dollar spent on the Market Access Program returns \$2 to \$7 to the economy; they know that the products that benefit from this program are typically grown on the West Coast and in the South, and that a lot less is spent on promoting them than is spent on promoting grain exports; and they know that all grant recipients are selected not to promote their specific products but to promote the sale of U.S. agricultural goods that are used in their products. Further, they know that as the program was amended in the farm bill, foreign corporations are no longer eligible to participate, nor are large American corporations. Only small businesses and farmer cooperatives are eligible for funding. This program always benefited producers, but the way it is now constituted the benefit goes clearly and directly to them.

(See other side)

YEAS (55)			NAYS (42)		NOT VOTING (3)	
Republicans (31 or 62%)	Democrats (24 or 51%)		Republicans (19 or 38%)	Democrats (23 or 49%)	Republicans (3)	Democrats (0)
Bennett	Hatfield	Akaka	Abraham	Biden	Kassebaum- ⁴	
Bond	Helms	Baucus	Ashcroft	Bingaman	Shelby- ²	
Burns	Hutchison	Boxer	Brown	Bradley	Stevens- ²	
Campbell	Jeffords	Breaux	Chafee	Bryan		
Coats	Kempthorne	Conrad	Coverdell	Bumpers		
Cochran	Lott	Daschle	D'Amato	Byrd		
Cohen	Mack	Dorgan	DeWine	Dodd		
Craig	McConnell	Exon	Faircloth	Feingold		
Domenici	Murkowski	Feinstein	Grams	Glenn		
Frahm	Pressler	Ford	Gregg	Hollings		
Frist	Santorum	Graham	Inhofe	Inouye		
Gorton	Simpson	Harkin	Kyl	Johnston		
Gramm	Snowe	Heflin	Lugar	Kennedy		
Grassley	Specter	Kerrey	McCain	Kerry		
Hatch	Thomas	Kohl	Nickles	Lautenberg		
	Thurmond	Leahy	Roth	Levin		
		Moseley-Braun	Smith	Lieberman		
		Murray	Thompson	Mikulski		
		Pryor	Warner	Moynihan		
		Robb		Nunn		
		Sarbanes		Pell		
		Simon		Reid		
		Wellstone		Rockefeller		
		Wyden				

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

When the farm bill was passed, part of the savings from blocking grants from going to foreign-owned companies was used to increase grants for American small businesses and cooperatives. We wholly support that increase. Market promotion assistance is one of the government trade activities that is legal under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the United States' competitors are spending huge sums promoting their products. The pittance that is spent in comparison by the United States on the Market Access Program is clearly inadequate. Though it is inadequate, we are willing to retain the current funding level agreed to in February as a fair compromise. That level was set at \$90 million and the spending was made mandatory. We urge our colleagues not to reopen this argument by placing a restriction on this compromise, mandatory language that is only a few months old. We urge them to reject the Bryan amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

This past February the Senate voted, 59 to 37, to accept an amendment to the farm bill to cut funding for the Market Access Program from \$110 million to \$70 million and to limit eligibility for that program to domestic companies. Forty million was cut because that was the amount that was saved by limiting eligibility for program funds to American companies. When that bill came back from conference, it still limited eligibility to American companies, but it increased spending by \$20 million. The Bryan amendment would cut spending back to \$70 million.

We have fought to eliminate funding for this program for years. The Market Access Program (formerly called the Market Promotion Program) gives money to companies to advertise their products overseas. Some of the largest corporations in the world, with advertising budgets in the tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars, have signed up for this free advertising money. In 1992, the top 50 participants received about \$1 million each. Recipients over the years have included MacDonald's, Sunkist, and Ernest & Julio Gallo. We think that this program is a horrible waste of money.

Our colleagues, thankfully, agreed with us on the farm bill in banning foreign companies from getting any of this money. If we are going to give corporate welfare, we should at least only give it to American companies. However, the conferees on that bill then used the excuse that they saved \$40 million in corporate welfare to foreigners to increase spending by \$20 million in corporate welfare to Americans. The Bryan amendment would eliminate that extra \$20 million in spending. We urge our colleagues not to table this amendment.